PMComanchePeakPEm Resource

From: Galvin, Dennis
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2011 2:51 PM
To: Donald Woodlan
Cc: Monarque, Stephen; ComanchePeakCOL Resource
Subject: FW: Follow-up on RAI 3.7.3-4
Attachments: image001.gif

Don,

The staff has prepared a summary of the points it raised during the discussion of RAI (Question) 3.7.3-4. Luminant indicated that its path-forward would be to address these points in a revised response to RAI (Question) 3.7.3-4.

Thanks,

Dennis Galvin
Project Manager
NRC/NRO/DNRL/NMIP
301-415-6256

From: Valentin, Milton
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2011 2:38 PM
To: Galvin, Dennis
Subject: Follow-up on RAI 3.7.3-4

Dennis,

Below is the revised list of questions regarding the response to RAI 3.7.3-4.

- Luminant should provide a technical argument justifying why the peak of the base slab ISRS necessarily bounds the peak of the basin wall ISRS
- What are the geometry and configuration of the basin walls being considered, and what is the connection to the geometry and configuration of the base slab being considered? How are the frequencies of the walls and base slab related?
- There are several walls in the UHSRS including external walls and internal walls that separate different rectangular regions. Luminant should identify the walls being considered and describe how the use of the base slab spectrum is conservative for each case.
- It would be very helpful if Luminant were to provide a stronger physical argument for the use of the base slab spectrum.
- It would be very helpful if Luminant were to provide a physical basis for why the use of the base slab spectrum is conservative.
- Where is the base slab ISRS derived?
- What does the 10 Hz peak in the base slab ISRS represent? That is, what is causing the amplification?
- Based on Luminant's statements that the increase in the design force is in the range of 8% and the original design goal was to achieve D/C ratios of less than 0.9, this suggests that current D/C ratios could be close to unity. This warrants a bit more attention and detail.
- Because of the previous observation, it is my opinion that Luminant should include (quantify) this effect in their structural calculations rather than addressing as an after the fact spot check.

Milton O. Valentín, ME
Office of New Reactors
milton.valentin@nrc.gov
301-415-4061

Hearing Identifier: ComanchePeak_COL_Public
Email Number: 1309

Mail Envelope Properties (6F9E3C9DCAB9E448AAA49B8772A448C585835CA763)

Subject: FW: Follow-up on RAI 3.7.3-4
Sent Date: 4/11/2011 2:51:09 PM
Received Date: 4/11/2011 2:51:10 PM
From: Galvin, Dennis

Created By: Dennis.Galvin@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Monarque, Stephen" <Stephen.Monarque@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"ComanchePeakCOL Resource" <ComanchePeakCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Donald Woodlan" <Donald.Woodlan@luminant.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	2245	4/11/2011 2:51:10 PM
image001.gif	4189	

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:


U.S.NRC
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Protecting People and the Environment